DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 050 793

LI 002 855

AUTHOR Sisson, Jacqueline D.
TITLE Cooperative System of Ohio Art Libraries.
INSTITUTION Ohio State Univ. Libraries, Columbus.
SPONS AGENCY Ohio State Library, Columbus.
PUB DATE 69
NOTE 46p.
AVAILABLE FROM Ohio State University Libraries, 1858 Neil Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43210 ($2.00)

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Art, Art Materials, Financial Support, Interlibrary Loans, Library Acquisition, *Library Collections, Library Cooperation, *Library Networks, Public Libraries, *Reference Books, *Research Libraries, Special Libraries, Union Catalogs, University Libraries
IDENTIFIERS *Art Libraries, Ohio

ABSTRACT

The results of this study outline the plans for the establishment of a cooperative network of Ohio Art Libraries. Academic, Special, and Public Libraries are included. The study reveals that these several libraries jointly possess a major art research resource. In addition to sharing, it was decided that a clearly defined program outlining areas of responsibility of each library would result in better use of funds for purchase of retrospective materials. It recommends joint requests for additional financial assistance and the establishment of a cooperative buying program. (Author)

ED050793

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Ohio State University Libraries
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER"

Cooperative System of Ohio Art Libraries

by Jacqueline D. Sisson

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

LI 002 855

The Ohio State University Libraries
1969

The research for this project was supported by the State Library of Ohio under the Library Services and Construction Act, Title III.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
	Introduction	1
I	Chronology of Events	4
II	Bibliographic Checks	8
III	Cooperative Book Selection	13
IV	Photoduplication and Interlibrary Loan Policies	17
V	Union Catalogs	20
VI	Recommendations	24
VII	Financial Report	26
	Appendices	27

INTRODUCTION

The original purpose of this study was solely to determine the feasibility of establishing a cooperative network of Ohio art research libraries. It has resulted in more than just an investigation. Ideas have been acted upon and several cooperative measures have already been implemented in order to attain immediate reciprocal use of the potential of the present collections. These already established outcomes of the study were made possible due to the exceptional cooperation of the institutions involved, the experience and enthusiasm of the art librarians and the evident need for the establishment of such cooperative measures.

The response to the final ballot (Appendix I) leaves no doubt that the eleven institutions taking part in the study agree that the major Ohio art research libraries should become an established group, holding annual or biannual meetings. In order to avoid costly duplication of purchases of retrospective titles, the libraries in this network have agreed to be responsible for the purchase of source materials in a mutually agreed-to area of specialization which, in addition to enriching the holdings of the network, will also strengthen the academic programs of the colleges or universities or the special needs of the users

of each individual library. The only point of dissension, that of incorporation, has been removed by the recent knowledge that a formalized legal procedure is not necessary in order to fulfill the requirements of public, private and federal funding agencies. A statement of purpose and policy has been drafted and is now being circulated for the signatures of the directors or librarians of the participating institutions (Appendix II).

It was originally intended that at least two visits be made to each library, but after the first round of visits was completed, it became evident that further visits would not be needed in order to establish excellent working relations and good communications. The library visits also revealed that contrary to expectation, a large majority of the libraries visited contained strong research collections.

The main obstacle preventing full use of the potential of the art collections in Ohio is the lack of a complete union catalog. Of the eleven participants the holdings of only five are represented in either or both the Ohio State Library Union Card Catalog and the Case Western Reserve Union Card Catalog. It was decided at the June 19, 1968 meeting that part of the investigator's travel funds should be used to subsidize a bibliographic check, in ten of the eleven cooperating libraries, of Mary Chamberlin's Guide to Art Reference Books (hereafter cited as Chamberlin) and in all eleven institutions of E. Louise Lucas' Books on

Art (hereafter cited as Lucas). This project, which is partially completed, is explained in detail in the text of this report.

Publicity issued by the State Library of Ohio and The Ohio State University resulted in national interest in the study and its conclusions. Upon reading the Libraries Notes, issued by The Ohio State University Libraries, The Ohio State University Research Foundation volunteered to help locate sources of grants for cooperative book purchases. Sequels to the State Library of Ohio releases were a letter from Miss Irene M. Hall of the Washington Office of the American Library Association suggesting a possible source for federal aid and calls from the Ohio Art Council, the Library Journal and the Chicago Board of Education requesting additional information and copies of the final report. The Ohio Art Council expects to publish a note about the study in its publication. The Art Journal published by the College Art Association and the Arts Digest Newsletter may also include announcements. Interest in the project was expressed at various American Library Association meetings and in Boston during the College Art Association Conference.

The participants in this study are most grateful to the Ohio State Library Board for making the grant available since it has resulted in a rapprochement which would never have existed without the incentive induced by the encouragement of the Board. An officially recognized group of Art Research Libraries of Ohio (ARLO) is being formed in order to continue present close communication and cooperation.

CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS

1. January 1968. Request for Title III support of this study was drafted and presented to the Advisory Council of the Ohio State Library Board.

2. February 24, 1968. Letter sent to the Cincinnati Public Library, Cleveland Museum of Art, Cleveland Public Library, Oberlin College, Ohio University, Toledo Museum of Art and the University of Cincinnati advising them of the request for LSCA Title III support of the study and asking them for their opinions of such a study.

3. April 4, 1968. Request for LSCA Title III support approved. Letter sent to above institutions advising them of the approval of the request. Three institutions were added to the original list of eight: The Cincinnati Museum of Art, Denison University, and Ohio Dominican College.

4. May 1-20, 1968. Funds became available on May 1. Letter and questionnaire sent to the participants. Follow-up calls and correspondence pertaining to questionnaire. Appointments made by phone for visits to each library. Results of questionnaire studied and a resume compiled (Appendix III).

5. May 20-June 10, 1968. Visits made to each library to discuss the study with each librarian and in some cases with the head librarian. Collections of most institutions were scanned when time permitted. Investigator acted as consultant on library matters for several of the smaller libraries being interviewed. Distributed resumes of the questionnaires as well as copies of The Ohio State University Fine Arts Library List of New Acquisitions. Each participant was asked to give some thought to the usefulness of such lists.

6. June 11-18, 1968. Follow-up calls and general correspondence setting date for a group meeting. Arrangements made for a room assignment, luncheon and rental of a tape recorder for the meeting.

7. June 19, 1968, 10:00 a.m. - Noon, 1:30-4:45 p.m. Meeting of eleven librarians held at The Ohio State University Student Union. Complete meeting recorded. Meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m. and participants made a brief visit to The Ohio State University Fine Arts Library.

8. June 20-September 30, 1968. Complete transcript made from tape of June 19 meeting. Copies of the 40-page transcript sent to each participant.

9. July 1968. Funds sent to each institution to cover clerical expenses for a bibliographic check of Chamberlin.

10. August 30 - September 30, 1968. Master copy compiled of Chamberlin's index.

11. October 1-17, 1968. Phone calls and correspondence pertaining to October 19 meeting in Cleveland during the Ohio Library Association Annual Conference. Arrangements for location of this meeting were made by Mr. Stephen Matyi of the Cleveland Public Library Art Department. Consultations with The Ohio State University legal advisors about regulations for incorporation. Interviews with representatives of The Ohio State University News and Information Service and the Ohio State Lantern. Phone discussions with the Research Foundation of The Ohio State University concerning possible sources for supplemental funds for the network.

**** Except for funds set aside for bibliographic check (see 13 below), the grant funds were all used by October 19. All further expenses assumed by the investigator and The Ohio State University Library ****

12. October 19, 1968. Breakfast meeting held in Cleveland. Attended by librarians from Cleveland Museum of Art, Cleveland Public Library, Denison University, Oberlin College, The Ohio State University, Ohio University, and The University of Cincinnati. Copies of the master index of Chamberlin were distributed to those attending the meeting.

13. October 22, 1968. Funds distributed to all libraries for a bibliographic check of Lucas. No immediate deadline set for the completion of this check.

14. October 29, 1968. Letter sent to all institutions giving a resume of the October 19 meeting. This letter also included matters not brought up during the meeting. Final ballot sent along with a cover letter explaining each point. Copies of master index of Chamberlin sent to those not present at the Cleveland meeting.

15. November 14, 1968. Correspondence with Case Western Reserve University and the State Library of Ohio about union card catalogs.

16. November 14-16, 1968. Compilation of ballots.

17. December 1968. Meeting with Mrs. Renée Peterson of The Ohio State University Research Foundation about the network and its needs. Mrs. Peterson at this time reported on the results of her personal contact

with various foundations (Appendix IV). Detailed report on ARLO sent to Miss Mary Davis, Assistant to the President, Kress Foundation, along with a request for an appointment to meet with her in Boston during the College Art Association Conference in January 1969. First draft of final report written.

18. January 1-28, 1969. Trip partially subsidized by The Ohio State University was made to The Office of Library Planning and Development in Washington, D. C. Discussions with Miss Katherine Stokes and others concerning the guidelines for the Higher Education Act (HEA), Title II, College Library Resources funds and federal interpretation of an "officially recognized cooperative group." Five interviews were made during this one day trip with various officials. Asked whether federal funds are available to public libraries for book purchases. It was learned in the course of one of these interviews that The Office of Library Planning and Development was already aware of the activities of ARLO and that a folder for ARLO was on file. Report sent to Denison University, Oberlin College, Ohio Dominican College, Ohio University and The University of Cincinnati on the results of the investigation of HEA, Title II, College Library Resources funds. Letter sent to Cincinnati Public Library and Cleveland Public Library advising them to look into federal grants for book purchases. Compilation of a summary of the final report and proposal for LSCA, Title III support of the organizational expenses of ARLO's first year were prepared and presented to the Ohio State Library Advisory Council for LSCA, Title III.

19. January 29, 1969. Arranged an informal meeting of art librarians during the College Art Association Conference in Boston. Thirty-seven art librarians representing institutions in the United States and Canada attended the meeting. A brief report on ARLO was made at the request of several of the librarians. A great deal of interest in the project was expressed and requests were made for more detailed information. This meeting was quite fortunate. It was learned that two different groups were in the process of establishing art librarian conferences. Good communications and cooperation were established during the discussions and each group will hold future meetings which will have different approaches and objectives.

20. January 30, 1969. Meeting in Boston with Miss Mary Davis of the Kress Foundation. Although not willing to allocate funds to ARLO this year, Miss Davis requested that the Kress Foundation be kept advised of ARLO's progress and that the investigator visit the foundation's offices whenever in New York.

21. February 1969. Revisions made of the proposal for LSCA Title III support of ARLO.

22. March 1969. Constitution composed for ARLO and distributed to members for comments. Request received from Mr. Herbert Scherer, Art Librarian at The University of Minnesota that a report be made on ARLO to the art membership of the American Library Association in Atlantic City. Request received by phone from Mrs. Florence Da Luiso that investigator send an application to attend the HEA Title II art institute being held at The University of New York at Buffalo on June 16-20, 1969.

23. April 1969. Compiled information and filled out forms for HEA Title II funds for Oberlin College, Ohio Dominican College, The Ohio State University, Ohio University and The University of Cincinnati. Joint request totaled $120,000.

24. May 1969. Final draft of report completed.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC CHECKS, LISTS OF NEW ACQUISITIONS AND EVALUATIONS OF COLLECTIONS

Upon completion of the bibliographic check of Chamberlin in ten of the institutions, the principal investigator received from each institution photocopies of the marked indices of this book. A fifty-seven page master index was compiled indicating location of the titles, and photocopies were sent to each institution (see Appendix V for a table of the percentage of each institution's holdings of titles listed in Chamberlin).

This master index is meant as a temporary substitute for a union catalog and is presently useful in the following ways:

1. By better knowledge of other collections, library users can be advised about which collection should be used for in-depth research in particular areas.

2. By being aware of the location of certain titles, duplication of extremely expensive, infrequently used titles will often not be necessary.

3. By checking the master index for location of titles needed, interlibrary loan procedures can be expedited.

The use of such a system cannot, of course, replace a union catalog of the holdings of the collections. However, it can and in fact, it has been of some assistance in solving the communication problem. A similar bibliographic check of Lucas is now in process in all eleven institutions. The

participants have agreed to keep these indices up to date by notifying each other of any additions made to their collections which are recorded in the above two reference tools. Those issuing lists of new acquisitions will signify such additions through the use of symbols and numbers.

Such indices will be used in a variety of ways, depending on the institution. Main entries showing the location of titles listed in Chamberlin and Lucas which are not owned by The Ohio State University will be placed in this institution's Fine Arts Library card catalog. A distinct color will be used for these entries, thus distinguishing them from its own holdings. Faculty members and students can thus either apply for the book through interlibrary loan or they can visit the library owning the needed materials. This system is also going to be used at The Ohio State University Fine Arts Library for research materials selected from lists of new acquisitions received from participating members of ARLO. Having a record of the important holdings of other participants in the network interfiled with one's own holdings will also save time and book funds when selecting retrospective titles from antiquarian book dealers' lists. This procedure has been mentioned to others in the network; however, the decision about whether to implement it or not is up to the individual library.

Copies of serial check-in records have been provided to the group by the Cleveland Public Library, Ohio University and The Ohio State

University. All participants have also received copies of the print-out of serials holdings issued by the Oberlin College Library.

Lists of new acquisitions are regularly mailed to the eleven participants by Oberlin College, The Ohio State University Fine Arts Library, Ohio University Art Library, The Toledo Museum of Art Library and The University of Cincinnati's Design, Art and Architecture Library. The Cleveland Museum of Art Library has sent copies of a selected list of new acquisitions and Denison University mailed a trial copy of its list.

The lists of new acquisitions have been found useful as check lists for possible purchases. They have also in some cases solved original cataloging problems since the majority of these lists include call numbers. Some of the membership suggested that the format of these lists be uniform, using only one side of the page for the listings and placing them in a two-column arrangement thus making it possible to clip out listings of major purchases not listed in Chamberlin or Lucas, pasting them on 3x5 cards with an indication of the name of the institution owning the material. These cards can then be filed in the card catalog. This format is excellent, but not always possible. In some cases the lists are prepared by the main library and are not solely listings of the art holdings. In other cases the lists are so large that such a format would be too costly both in time and supplies. However,it was generally agreed that institutions compiling lists will provide copies to each participant and that members who do not issue such lists will at least keep their colleagues informed of major additions to their collections.

Although Chamberlin is an excellent bibliography of essential research material, it does not list artist monographs. Therefore, evaluating the collections of the participating libraries purely on the basis of their percentage of holdings listed in this reference book does not give an exact reflection of the strengths of the libraries participating in the bibliographic check.

An example of this would be the rating of Oberlin College (see Appendix III). This institution's holdings of important research materials in the field of Baroque art and American architecture are not reflected in its Chamberlin holdings. Some of the disparities between strengths of collection according to Chamberlin holdings and actual strengths will be resolved when the Lucas master index is compiled since this bibliography does list artist monographs.

There is no doubt that the Cleveland Museum of Art Library excels over all others in the group, but in general, the Cincinnati Public Library, Cleveland Public Library, Oberlin College and The Ohio State University are so close in the strength and quality of their collections that it is difficult to assign second place to any of them. The Cincinnati Museum of Art and the Toledo Museum of Art have smaller collections than the institutions mentioned above, but both are of excellent quality. In addition to these, the collections of Ohio University and Denison University, especially the former, though smaller in size were found to be well rounded and of

far better quality than one would expect considering the size of their institutions. Denison Univers ity was included in ARLO mainly on the basis of the donation to that university of a valuable collection of Burmese art. It was felt that the teaching curriculum at Denison University would be emphasizing Southeast Asian art. The University of Cincinnati Design, Art and Architecture Library was not as strong as expected, however, under the guidance of its present librarian and with its much improved book allocation, there is no doubt that the Design, Art and Architecture Library will quickly strengthen its collection. The recent lists of new acquisitions issued by that library clearly demonstrate this. The Ohio Dominican College does not at the present have a collection strong enough to support library research in art history, however, there is a strong possibility that this college along with several other Ohio colleges will be taking part in a cooperative program of Latin American studies. Since none of the research libraries show strength in this important area, it was felt by the investigator that the Ohio Dominican College should be included in ARLO and be given the opportunity to build a strong Latin American art book collection which would be of great benefit to the members of ARLO as well as the small colleges planning the cooperative Latin American studies.

COOPERATIVE BOOK SELECTION

In order to maintain the present quality of their collections and continue to show a rate of growth in both size and quality which is equivalent to that of libraries in other areas of the humanities, most of the libraries taking part in this study need larger book allocations. Frequently the cost of a rare book in, for example, the field of English literature is no more than the price of an average current art imprint. The Cincinnati Public Library, Cleveland Museum of Art, Cleveland Public Library and Oberlin College have strong art book collections because they were well subsidized in the past, therefore a large portion of important scholarly materials were purchased when published. The Ohio State University can take its place along with these libraries only due to improved book allocations which, since 1960, have permitted massive, extremely costly, retrospective purchases. The present book budgets of most of the libraries have not been proportionally increased with the rise in prices. It is due to ever increasing costs that it is necessary for the group to locate sources of supplemental funds which will enable them to further enrich their collections without sacrificing the purchase of needed current imprints. Therefore, since the costs of retrospective purchases in the field of art prohibit the purchase by each institution of all needed titles, it was felt that organized cooperative plans for the purchase of important, but infrequently used titles, could be implemented.

A study was made of the strengths of each collection. As suspected, it was soon discovered that purely by chance, the collections of eight of the institutions taking part in the study already contain clear areas of specialization which do not duplicate those of the other participants and that through already established purchasing patterns, these specialized collections will continue to be improved as funds permit.

The institutions all agreed that in order to avoid unnecessary duplication of infrequently used, but essential research materials, the major portion of supplemental funds received for ARLO will be used for the strengthening of their individual area or areas of specialization and that liberal interlibrary loan policies will be extended to the others in the network. Those libraries which do not at present have clear areas of specialization have agreed to accept assigned areas of responsibility (See Appendix VI).

During the June meeting it was suggested by the investigator that art librarians in cities having several ARLO members should consult each other before purchasing major bibliographic and reference tools; thus through organized cooperative measures, enabling them to increase the number of titles available for consultation by avoiding duplication. The libraries can then share bibliographic information by telephone or through photocopying services.

Since art research libraries cannot function without excellent periodical holdings, the group decided that supplemental funds would also be used

to fill in or purchase reprints of the essential periodicals which most of the libraries should own. It was also agreed that libraries having the most complete runs of certain foreign periodicals would be assigned the responsibility of completing their sets, making it possible for members of the network to have available through photocopying services nearly any articles needed by library users. A Serials Committee of ARLO will be nominated for the purpose of selecting and assigning these areas of responsibilities. The group has also agreed to a proposal that each library accept the responsibility of subscribing to one foreign periodical not presently represented in ARLO's holdings. The recent availability of serial reprints makes the implementation of cooperative purchases of serials a realistic project if funds can be located to subsidize the program.

Mrs. Renée Peterson of The Ohio State University Research Foundation has already contacted several foundations (See Appendix IV). To date no real support has been located, but it is hoped that with concentrated efforts success can be achieved during the coming year. Although Miss Mary Davis of the Kress Foundation expressed great interest in the project to the investigator during a Boston interview, she felt that the effectiveness of the group's purposes was still untried and that the Foundation is unwilling to speculate with its funds. Her main objection to ARLO was the possibility of the group's dissolving due to changes in library administrations.

Much of the success of ARLO is dependent on locating substantial allocations for the purchase of books and serials in the various areas of specialization.

Good results can be obtained from the present collections, but it is our goal to provide students and scholars with nearly all titles required for in-depth research. A three year subsidy of $75,000 per year would place the members of ARLO in the enviable position of being able to offer, as a cooperative group, excellent resources in the field of art. After the third year, each institution's regular book allocation would, hopefully, be sufficient to support both current and retrospective purchases.

PHOTODUPLICATION AND INTERLIBRARY LOAN POLICIES

All libraries agreed to furnish speedy photoduplication services to others in the system. The cost agreed to is 10¢ per page. Furnishing this service will be inconvenient for the staff of the Cleveland Museum of Art and the Toledo Museum of Art, especially since the staff from the latter has to go to an outside institution to have the copies made. The Cleveland Museum of Art will reduce its usual rate of 20¢ to 10¢ per page for ARLO members.

Full use of interlibrary loan facilities are hindered by the lack of a union catalog. All members, except the Cleveland Museum of Art, agreed to liberalize their interlibrary loan policies, but no set format was established. The term "liberal" had a different meaning for each institution. Some institutions freely circulate titles which in another institution are classified noncirculating. All agreed that due to the close relationship resulting from this study, interlibrary loan requests from members will be screened with a more liberal point of view. A committee will be appointed to establish an interlibrary loan code.

During the June meeting it was also revealed that some institutions, none of them participants of the study, are quite negligent about the use made of, and the packing of, borrowed materials. It was agreed by the group that should any member be found negligent in these areas, loans

could and should be refused. An important concern for all the members was whether the lending libraries' specifications of "library use only" are really honored by the borrowing library. The principal investigator suggested to the group that to guarantee the careful use of expensive titles, such requests could be screened by the art librarian of the borrowing library. The principal investigator suggested to the group that to guarantee the careful use of expensive titles, such requests could be screened by the art librarian of the borrowing library and that if it was felt that the person requesting the material was a responsible person, the librarian would personally make the interlibrary loan request. When received, the book would be delivered to the librarian who in turn would allow its use only within her sight and would forbid the use of photoduplication equipment. The group was interested in this proposal, but several voiced a hesitancy to accept the responsibility. Loss of materials while in transport was also a source of grave concern. This system of personal responsibility for borrowed materials was recently implemented for a loan made by The Ohio State University Fine Arts Library from the Cleveland Public Library Art Department.

Reluctance on the part of some of the libraries to lend materials to the Cleveland Museum of Art was discussed at length during the June meeting. It was suggested that library materials should only be lent to institutions extending reciprocal loans. Bringing this resentment to the surface was beneficial since part of the difficulties was caused by a lack of

communications. The representative of the Cleveland Museum of Art repeatedly expressed that institution's concern over its noncirculating policies and its appreciation for loans made to it. The investigator of this study expressed the opinion that the existence of one noncirculating collection, which also happens to be the richest collection in the network, is to the benefit of all scholars since it provides them with materials which are nearly always available for personal consultation. This opinion did not meet with unanimous approval, however, no one suggested that the Cleveland Museum of Art be excluded from ARLO nor was it proposed that loans be restricted to those who extend loans. The Cleveland Museum of Art volunteered to provide photoduplication services up to 200 pages at 10¢ per page as a gesture of appreciation for loans made to its library and curators. This gesture on the part of the museum library was enthusiastically received by members of the group.

UNION CATALOGS

The isolationism and regionalism caused by a lack of knowledge of the strengths of other Ohio art libraries noticeably dissipated during the June meeting through individual reports on the areas of specialization in each participating institution, the resumes of the first questionnaire and later the distribution of the master index of Chamberlin.

As stated in the Introduction, the main obstacle preventing full use of the potential of the art collections in Ohio is the lack of either one central union catalog of the holdings of the art libraries or the participation of all ARLO members in at least one of the existing or planned union catalogs. Answers to the first questionnaire and discussions which took place during the first meeting revealed that contrary to the belief of some of the institutions taking part in the study, some are not represented in any union catalog, including the National Union Catalog, while others are not represented in any of the Ohio union card catalogs. The three institutions whose collections were best known by all the participants in the study - the Cleveland Museum of Art, the Cleveland Public Library and Oberlin College - thought that The Ohio State University was represented in the Case Western Reserve Union Card Catalog, however, this institution discontinued sending cards in 1960. Since this is exactly the year when The

Ohio State University Fine Arts Library first received a substantial increase in book allocations for the purchase of retrospective materials, the institutions depending on the Case Western Reserve Union Card Catalog have not been able to make full interlibrary use of the much improved collection.

The art libraries of the Cincinnati Public Library and The Ohio State University are good examples of strong collections, recognized by out-of-state specialists, but relatively unknown in Ohio. The Ohio State University Fine Arts Library fills a large number of interlibrary loan requests received from large out-of-state institutions, but it receives few requests from Ohio institutions, perhaps due to too great a reliance on the completeness of the Ohio union card catalogs.

At the present time the holdings of the Cleveland Museum of Art, Cleveland Public Library, Oberlin College and The University of Cincinnati are represented in the Case Western Reserve Union Card Catalog. The Cleveland Public Library and Cincinnati Public Library send cards to the Ohio State Library Union Card Catalog. This leaves six libraries not represented in either of these catalogs. The establishment of The Ohio College Library Center will include Denison University, The Ohio State University, Ohio University, Ohio Dominican College and the University of Cincinnati. This leaves two institutions, the Cincinnati Museum of Art and the Toledo Museum of Art, not represented in any union catalog.

Although marked copies of Chamberlin and Lucas, exchanges of lists of new acquisitions and/or notifications of important acquisitions will be

of value, they cannot fulfill all the requirements of scholars. It has been suggested that G. K. Hall Company be contacted about the possibility of publishing a catalog recording the art holdings of the eleven institutions. This suggestion will be acted upon, but it was felt by most members that such a publication would not have enough marketable value to be accepted by the above publisher. It was also felt that it would not completely fill ARLO's requirements since, unless frequent supplements are issued, it would be out-of-date by the time it was published.

A book catalog was suggested in the first questionnaire and though at first the idea was not well received, it was finally agreed that if the initial expenses could be subsidized by outside funds, a book catalog would be quite useful. However, as in the case of a Hall catalog, it would be quickly out-of-date and the participating institutions would have to accept the cost of keeping such a catalog up-to-date.

If a union card catalog or a book catalog cannot be implemented, teletype communications between the various institutions, not necessarily between the art libraries, would be quite useful to establish the location of needed titles for interlibrary loan purposes. This solution is probably, in the long run, the most economical. Only one machine would be needed per city, and those using it would pay the cost of each message. Of the eleven institutions taking part in the study, only one has teletype equipment. The availability of such equipment in Cleveland, Cincinnati, Oberlin, Athens and Toledo would be of great benefit not only to the art network, but also to scholars in other areas.

The group's desire to gain a better knowledge of the various collections is clearly reflected in the completion of the master index to Chamberlin, the exchanges of lists of new acquisitions and the compilation of a master index of Lucas which is now in process.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the participants continue as a group, whether it be a formal group such as an association or an informal group as it has been during the past nine months.

2. That every effort be made to find a mutually acceptable means of being official since grants are dependent on this, but that the future existence of the group not be jeopardized if the means of becoming such a group causes the loss of any member.

3. That a grant be located to subsidize the first year of the network's existence. One institution and its librarian would act as sponsor and coordinator respectively. The coordinator would be responsible for preparing a statement of purpose, establishing regular meetings, keeping close communications between members, searching for outside subsidies, publicity, etc.

4. That the name of the network be Art Research Libraries of Ohio (ARLO).

5. That other institutions be invited to join the group if their collections make them eligible as subject specialists or research libraries.

6. That supplemental book allocations be found to strengthen the present areas of specialization and serials holdings.

7. That a study be made of the best means of establishing speedy communication for interlibrary loan.

8. That the Cleveland Museum of Art, Cleveland Public Library and Oberlin College continue sending catalog cards to the Case Western Reserve Union Catalog and that the Toledo Museum of Art be encouraged to begin sending cards to this Union Card Catalog.

9. That the Cincinnati Public Library and the University of Cincinnati continue sending cards to the Ohio State Library Union Card Catalog and that the Cincinnati Museum of Art be encouraged to also send cards to this Union Card Catalog.

10. That the close relations and better understanding of each other's problems created by this study be encouraged to continue through better communications of libraries within the same city.

11. That if time permits, reference and bibliographic services be extended to members of the network.

12. That the group publish bibliographies at the rate of one a year.

13. That the art librarians in the network volunteer their services whenever possible to act as consultants to smaller art libraries if these libraries request assistance.

14. That some means be found of bringing to national attention the excellent library resources Ohio can provide to scholars and the possibilities of cooperation between different types of institutions.

FINANCIAL REPORT

Principal Investigator	$ 917.00
Extra labor - Ohio State University	1,040.00
Extra labor - participants	1,185.04
Supplies	2.45
Reproduction	56.00
Travel	428.25
Communication	53.50
Equipment rental	23.00
Luncheon, June 19. 11 persons	37.45
Breakfast, October 19. 10 persons	13.31
Total Direct Costs	$3,756.00
Overhead, administrative costs	751.00
Total Cost	$4,507.00

APPENDIX I

Please return this ballot by November 13, 1968. Thank you.

BALLOT

Note: Those answering NO to item 1. a. may wish not to vote on the remaining issues.

1. a. Does your institution want to become a member of some type of official group of Ohio art libraries which will be limited to research and/or subject specialists?

Yes 9 No 0 Undecided 2

Remarks:

b. Do you think that incorporating would be a suitable means of organizing?

Yes 7 No 1 Undecided 3

Remarks:

2. Should group meet at least once a year?

Yes 11 No 0

Remarks:

3. Vote for one:

Should a chairman be elected once a year? Yes 9 No 0
or
Should chairmanship be filled on a rotating basis by each member of the group? Yes 2 No 0

Ballot (page 2)

4. Would you be willing to serve on a committee? Yes 7 No 1
(3 abstained)

5. Do you agree that interlibrary loan privileges between member institutions should be liberalized? (Cleveland Museum of Art included in interlibrary loan privileges even though they do not at present time lend materials) Yes 11 No 0

Remarks: One voted YES if funds are available for duplicates.

6. Do you agree that a committee of three should be organized to study and present to the group for approval an interlibrary loan policy and procedure? Yes 8 No 2
(1 abstained)

If YES please list three names to serve on this committee, including your own if you would like to serve on it.

1. Only 4 people listed names.
2.
3.

7. Do you agree that those libraries compiling lists of New Acquisitions continue sending them to all the other libraries and that if the format of the list allows it the following should be included: call number, author, title, publisher, date published and if applicable, the Chamberlin and/or Lucas number.

Yes 10 No 1

Remarks:

8. Do you agree that those not issuing Lists of New Acquisitions should periodically notify all the others of major purchases and of additions to Chamberlin and Lucas holdings?

Yes 10 No 0 (1 abstained)

Ballot (page 3)

9. a. Do you agree to accept the responsibility to subscribe to one foreign periodical not now subscribed to by any of our institutions?

Yes 10 No 0

Remarks:

Denison will agree if it can make its own choice.

b. Do you wish to serve on this committee? Yes 3 No 5

10. Which do you feel should be our first concern:

a. Search for financial support for book funds? Yes 8 No 0
or
b. Search for financial support for establishment of a Union Catalog and connecting communications such as teletype? Yes 3 No 0

11. Does your institution approve our investigating possible private and/or federal sources for financial support? Yes 11 No 0

12. Do you think that we should attempt to sponsor the establishment of an Ohio Library Association Round Table for all Ohio art libraries?

Yes 8 No 1 (2 abstained)

If YES
Do you think this should be worked on this coming year or later?

3 Coming Year 5 Later

_____ Your Signature _____ Date

_____ Signature of Director of Library or Museum.

APPENDIX II

ART RESEARCH LIBRARIES OF OHIO

ARTICLE I

The name of this organization shall be the Art Research Libraries of Ohio (ARLO).

ARTICLE II
PURPOSE

The purpose of this organization shall be to establish and maintain a strong network of cooperative art libraries and:

1. To have the common objective of strengthening the art library resources of Ohio.

2. To extend interlibrary loan privileges to member institutions.

3. To promote in-depth research in the history of art.

4. To attract scholars to Ohio.

5. To encourage scholars to make full-use of non-circulating materials available for consultation in member libraries.

6. To extend prompt photoduplication services to member institutions.

7. To encourage member libraries in the same vicinity to establish close communications with particular reference to the purchase of bibliographic tools.

8. To seek supplemental financial support to further the group's objectives.

9. To provide consulting services whenever possible to smaller art libraries.

10. To encourage interested persons to pursue careers in art librarianship.

ARTICLE III
MEMBERSHIP

Membership will be limited to libraries containing resources for in-depth research in one or more areas of the history of art. Applications for membership will be screened by ARLO members and brought to a vote. Approval by three quarters of the members will be required.

ARTICLE IV
COMMITMENTS

Members of the group agree to:

1. Continue strengthening their collections in a mutually agreed upon area or areas of specialization within the limits set by their book allocations while at the same time not weakening their holdings in other areas of their collections which are vital for their library users. The area or areas of specialization to be determined by present strength of holdings.

2. Use supplemental funds received for the support of ARLO for purchases of materials in their area or areas of specialization and for purchases of assigned serial fill-ins and reprints.

3. Furnish all ARLO members with copies of their lists of new acquisitions if such lists are compiled by their institutions. Whenever the format allows it, Chamberlin and Lucas numbers will be listed. If format does not permit inclusion of such numbers, membership must be notified of such acquisitions in a monthly or quarterly list.

4. Notify all ARLO members of purchases listed in Chamberlin and Lucas on a monthly or quarterly basis if their institution does not compile a list of new acquisitions. They will also notify members whenever a major retrospective title is added to their collections.

5. Offer in-depth reference services and adequate study facilities whenever time and space permit to visiting scholars from member institutions.

ARTICLE V
OFFICERS

A chairman and vice-chairman are to be elected by the members for two year terms. The term of office will commence two (2) weeks after the election. In the absence or resignation of the chairman, the vice-chairman will assume his duties and a new vice-chairman will be elected within sixty (60) days of the resignation of the chairman. The vice-chairman will become chairman at the end of his two-year term.

The duties of the elected officers shall be as follows:

1. Chairman

    a. Preside at all meetings.

    b. Make appointments to committees, both standing and ad hoc.

    c. Keep members informed of developments.

    d. Perform such other duties as normally devolve upon this office.

2. Vice-Chairman

    a. Perform the duties of Secretary.

    b. Assume such duties as may be delegated to him by the Chairman.

    c. Act as Chairman in the absence of the Chairman.

ARTICLE VI
NOMINATION AND ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Section 1. NOMINATION. The chairman shall appoint a nomination committee of three active members to prepare a slate of not fewer than two candidates for the office of vice-chairman. The committee shall obtain the written consent of each candidate before placing his name on the ballot.

Section 2. ELECTION. The officers shall be elected by mail ballot fourteen (14) days before the expiration of the chairman's term. A majority vote of the members shall constitute election.

ARTICLE VII
EXECUTIVE BOARD

The Executive Board shall consist of the elected officers, the immediate past chairman and the coordinator of ARLO. The Board shall have general supervision of the affairs of ARLO in the interval between meetings.

ARTICLE VIII
MEETINGS

Meetings are held once a year at a time and place to be determined by the chairman. A special meeting may be called by the chairman, vice-chairman or by any five (5) members presenting a written request. All members will be notified at least thirty (30) days prior to a meeting. Robert's Rules of Order, revised, latest edition, shall govern all meetings.

ARTICLE IX
YEAR

The year will be from July 1 to June 30.

ARTICLE X
DISSOLUTION

The organization can be dissolved only by a vote of two-thirds of its members.

APPENDIX III

SUMMARY OF FIRST QUESTIONNAIRE, MAY 1968:

Question no. 1. Do you wish to participate in this study?
Yes 11 No 0

Question no. 2. What area or areas are the strongest in your collection?

DENISON: "Although we probably have a good collection of art for a college of our size, I doubt that we could compare with any of the art libraries except in Burmese."

CINCINNATI ART MUSEUM: "General, but good in classical, Near Eastern, decorative arts, prints and printmaking. Unusually complete holdings of museum catalogs dating back to 1880's. Are building ourEarly Christian and early Twentieth Century collections."

CINCINNATI PUBLIC LIBRARY: "Karl Kup of the New York Public Library thinks we have one of the best public library art collections in the country. Weakest in contemporary art, but building up in this area. Excellent collection of book illustration."

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI: "Fairly strong in architecture, quite weak in all other areas."

CLEVELAND MUSEUM: "Sales catalogs, periodicals, building collections of festchrifts. Otherwise equally strong."

CLEVELAND PUBLIC LIBRARY: "Especially strong collection in architecture. Building up in time a nearly exhaustive collection in American Art."

OBERLIN: "Medieval architecture, early American architecture, Baroque painting. Special collection duplicating editions in Thomas Jefferson's Library."

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY: "Medieval and Renaissance art."

OHIO UNIVERSITY: "About evenly divided. Weak in classical, especially Roman. In the past we have concentrated on Renaissance through contemporary, plus current publications in other areas, especially African and Oriental."

OHIO DOMINICAN COLLEGE: "At present no definite area."

TOLEDO MUSEUM: "Glass, museum and private collection catalogs."

.....

Question no. 3. Would your library be willing to allocate part of your book budget for the purchase of retrospective titles in a mutually agreed to area?

Yes 11 No 1 (would need to know more)

Question no. 4. Would you be willing to accept foundation funds to support purchase of retrospective purchases in designated area or areas?

Yes 8 Unanswered 3

Question no. 5. Would you find it useful if the cooperating libraries exchanged marked copies of indices of Chamberlin and Lucas?

Yes 7 No 4

May 1968 Questionnaire
Page 3

Question no. 6. a. Do you maintain a separate file of your periodical holdings?

Yes 9 No 2

b. Do you feel that an exchange of such a file would be useful?

Yes 5 No 3
Unanswered 3

Question no. 7. Do you issue a list of new acquisitions?

Yes 6 No 5

Would you be willing to send a copy of each list to the other libraries in the cooperative network?

Yes 7 No 1
Unanswered 3

If you do not prepare a list, would you like to receive copies of such lists from others issuing them?

Yes 10 Uncertain 1

Question no. 8. Would you like to see the establishment of a book catalog?

Yes 6 No 4
Uncertain 1

May 1968 Questionnaire
Page 4

Question no. 9. Would you be interested in an exchange of xerox copies of the main entry of new acquisitions?

Yes 4 No 6
(1 interested in copies of original cataloging)

Do you feel it would be more practical to provide ten extra L. C. cards?

Yes 4 No 4
(2 uncertain, 1 willing to send cards for most unusual or important titles)

Question no. 10. Do you lend materials through interlibrary loan?

Yes 9 No 2

Question no. 11. Do you have access to teletype?

Yes 1 No 10

Question no. 12. Do you have facilities for photocopying?

Yes 9 No 2

What is cost per page?

8 @ 10¢ per page, 1 @ 25¢ per page

May 1968 Questionnaire
Page 5

Questions nos. 14 & 15.

(These questions requested information on each library's holdings of periodical indices and G. K. Hall library catalogs.)

Question no. 16. Would you be willing to furnish reference and bibliographic services for libraries in network?

Yes (some qualified)	8	No	1
Not applicable	2		

Question no. 17. Do you have standing orders for exhibition catalogs?

Yes	2	No	9

(Note: Museum libraries receive catalogs on exchange)

APPENDIX IV

REPORTS ON FOUNDATION GRANTS

Ford Foundation - Edward D'Arms. Acquisitions by the various Network members would not be of interest to them. As far as the mechanics and administration are concerned, he felt that the Council on Library Resources should definitely be approached. The Council may or may not be willing to entertain a request for money depending on the extent to which the problems are universal, to what extent the proposed solution is novel and replicable.

Carnegie Corporation - G. Jon Roush. Not interested. Carnegie does not have an arts division as such, nor have they made many grants in the arts.

Old Dominion Foundation - Ernest Brooks, Jr., President. They might be interested. They are currently assisting a computerized archive of art resources, the Computer Museum Network, administered by New York University. Old Dominion's unofficial policy is to make no grants to public institutions. There are two possibilities here: (1) Apply for a grant to cover the private members of the Network, (2) Apply for a grant to all members in the name of ARLO which will, of course, be a private organization.

Avalon Foundation - Mr. Albert Andrews, Vice President. They make no grant to public institutions under any circumstances. The Foundation might be willing to consider a request for funds for acquisitions to fill in the collections of members of ARLO which are not public institutions. They are not interested in making grants to a gallery for exhibition purposes.

Esso Education Foundation - They might be interested in the organization and mechanics, but only if we could point out clearly how such a system could be replicated not only for other art research libraries, but also in other subject areas. They are not interested in art as such.

APPENDIX V

ARLO's HOLDINGS OF TITLES LISTED IN CHAMBERLIN

Of the 2,372 titles listed in Chamberlin, only 177 are not presently in one or more of the ARLO collections.

A percentage of Chamberlin holdings was compiled by using 529 titles listed on pages selected at random from the master index.

Cleveland Museum of Art	74%
Ohio State University	68%
Cleveland Public Library	63%
Cincinnati Public Library	59%
Oberlin College	49%
University of Cincinnati	45%
Toledo Museum of Art	43%
Cincinnati Art Museum	37%
Ohio University	33%
Denison University	17%

Listed on the same pages used for the above percentages there were 48 titles which were owned by only one library. The percentages for one of a kind holdings are listed below:

Cleveland Museum of Art	33%
Ohio State University	17%
University of Cincinnati	17%
Cincinnati Public Library	10%
Cleveland Public Library	8%
Cincinnati Art Museum	6%
Oberlin College	4%
Toledo Museum of Art	4%
Denison University	0%
Ohio University	0%

Areas of Specialization
Page 2

Note: Cleveland Museum of Art and the Cincinnati Public Library are well-rounded collections with no special strengths in any special area outside of the few listed.

II. Present areas of specialization arranged by library.

Cincinnati Museum of Art -	Early museum catalogs, 1880-on, Near Eastern art, Early Christian art, Engraving, Costume.
Cincinnati Public Library -	Well-rounded collection. Will accept assigned area of responsibility. Has good collection of books on the artist as book illustrator. Picasso.
Cleveland Museum of Art -	Festschrifts, periodicals, oriental art and sales catalogs. Strong collection in all areas.
Cleveland Public Library -	Art Department - American art, antiques, porcelain. John G. White Collection. Oriental art.
Oberlin College -	Medieval architecture, early American architecture, Baroque art.
Ohio State University -	Medieval and Renaissance art including northern Renaissance.
*Ohio University -	Nineteenth century European art. American art, 1900-1945.
Toledo Museum of Art -	History of glass, catalogs of museum and private collections, sales catalogs.

* Willing to continue building in these areas. Was strengthening Renaissance area, but stepped aside for Ohio State University because of that institution's Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies.

Areas of Specialization
Page 3

University of Cincinnati - Classics Library: Classical art; Design, Architecture and Art Library: History of Architecture.

III. Areas of specialization which are not presently strong, but institutions are willing to build up.

Southeast Asian	-	Denison University
Renaissance architecture	-	Ohio State University
Latin American art	-	Ohio Dominican College

APPENDIX VI

AREAS OF SPECIALIZATION

I. Present areas of specialization arranged by period or type.

Near Eastern Art - Cincinnati Museum of Art
Oriental Art - Cleveland Museum of Art and Cleveland Public Library

Prehistoric Art - to be assigned
Classical Art - University of Cincinnati Classical Library
Early Christian Art - Cincinnati Museum of Art
Medieval Architecture - Oberlin College
Medieval Art - Ohio State University
Renaissance Painting - Ohio State University
Baroque Art - Oberlin College
Eighteenth Century - will have to be assigned, possibly to Cincinnati Public Library
Nineteenth Century European - Ohio University
Twentieth century - all have tried to keep up. Ohio University has taken responsibility for American art up to 1945

Architecture in general - University of Cincinnati
Early American architecture - Oberlin College
American Art - Cleveland Public Library
Graphics - Cincinnati Museum of Art
Graphics - 20th century - Cincinnati Public Library (The book and the artist)
Antiques - Cleveland Public Library
Costume - Cincinnati Museum of Art
Festchrifts - Cleveland Museum of Art
Periodicals - Cleveland Museum of Art
Glass - Toledo Museum of Art

Museum catalogs - Cincinnati Museum of Art, Cleveland Museum of Art, Toledo Museum of Art. Oberlin College has a sizeable collection.
Catalogs of private collections - Toledo Museum of Art
Sales Catalogs - Cleveland Museum of Art, Toledo Museum of Art
Exhibition Catalogs - Cincinnati Museum of Art, Cleveland Museum of Art, Toledo Museum of Art. Ohio State University from 1967-on.